

REMARKS

Applicant hereby traverses the outstanding rejections and requests reconsideration and withdrawal in view of the remarks contained herein. Applicant has canceled claims 7 and 3, and has amended claims 1, 12, 31, 41 and 42. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-34, 36, and 38-60 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claims 7 and 37 are objected to as repetitions of claim 3 and 33, respectively. Applicant has canceled claims 7 and 37.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-16 and 31-46 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claims 1, 12, 31, 41 and 42 to clarify the use of the term first resources. The claims have been amended only for the purpose of complying with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and not for the purpose of narrowing their scope in the face of prior art. No new matter has been entered. As the indefiniteness cited by the Examiner has been addressed with a corresponding amendment, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 1-16 and 31-46 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-26, 28-56 and 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,629,123 to Hunt, (hereinafter Hunt).

It is well settled that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim, see M.P.E.P. § 2131. Moreover, in order for a prior art reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to a claim, “[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim,” see M.P.E.P. § 2131, citing *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Furthermore, in order for a prior art reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to a claim, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim,” see M.P.E.P. § 2131, citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9

U.S.P.Q.2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection does not satisfy these requirements.

Claim 1, as amended, requires “for each of the one or more first resources, associating one or more first descriptions ... wherein at least one of the one or more first resources is discoverable using a corresponding first description”. Claim 1 further requires “associating one or more first explanations with a corresponding first description, wherein the first resource is discoverable using a corresponding first explanation”. These limitations are clearly not shown in Hunt.

Hunt describes distributed programming applications designed in an object oriented programming language, such as those applications designed according to the Microsoft Component Object Model, or COM. Column 6, lines 11-26. The larger applications are partitioned into one or more application units, or units, which are distributed in a distributed computing environment. Column 6, lines 13-20. A computer in the distributed system can execute a program, or component-based application that is developed as a package of component objects. Column 8, line 65 through column 9, line 1. The COM model defines interfaces standards for each component object. Column 9, lines 21-28. The component objects are language neutral and can be called by any language that can call a function using a pointer. Column 9, lines 42-50. The interfaces of the component objects are described using structures called type libraries, where the interface definition enumerates the number and type of all arguments passed through the interface functions. Column 9, lines 64 through column 10, line 2. To clarify, semantic features of the interface IDL attributes can be attached to each interface, where the attributes specify features such as the data flow direction of function arguments, etc. Column 10, lines 3-9.

The Examiner has equated the first resources of claim 1 with the libraries of Hunt and the interface functions with the first descriptions. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s characterizations. The Hunt libraries are not discoverable using the interface functions. The interface functions, as noted above and described in Hunt, enumerate the number and types of arguments passed through the interface functions. Further, the libraries are not discoverable using an attribute. The attributes of Hunt merely describe, or specify characteristics of the interface function, as is set forth above, and are not used to discover a

library. As, for at least the reasons set forth above, all of the limitations of claim 1 are clearly not taught or even suggested by Hunt, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claim 1 under §102(e) be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 7 have been canceled. Claims 2-4, 6, 8-11 and 13 each depend from claim 1 and thus inherit all of claim 1's limitations. Applicant, therefore, respectfully asserts that claims 2-4, 6, 8-11 and 13 are allowable, for at least the reasons set forth, over the 35. U.S.C. §102(e) rejection.

Claim 12, as amended, requires "for each of the one or more first resources, associating one or more first descriptions ... wherein at least one of the one or more first resources is discoverable using a corresponding first description". Claim 12 further requires "associating one or more first explanations with a corresponding first description ... wherein the first resource is discoverable using a corresponding first explanation". These limitations are clearly not shown in Hunt for at least the reasons described above. Specifically, Hunt does not show at least one of the one or more first resources discoverable using a corresponding description, nor does Hunt show a first resource discoverable using a corresponding first explanation. As Hunt does not describe all the limitation set forth in claim 12, claim 12 is allowable over the rejection of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 14-16 each depend from claim 12 and thus inherit all of claim 12's limitations. Applicant, therefore, respectfully asserts that claims 14-16 are allowable, for at least the reasons set forth, over the 35. U.S.C. §102(e) rejection.

Claim 17 requires "receiving a search request for the target resources from a client including a target description describing the target resources", "searching a database of resource information", "determining whether one or more resource descriptions match the target description", and "sending result information about matching resources to the client". Hunt does not describe these limitations.

As set forth above, Hunt describes a object oriented programming model that includes application units distributed across a distributed computing platform. Column 6, lines 11-26. These application units or objects have interfaces allowing them to be called by other

programs or applications. Column 9, lines 21-41. A client, or calling program, can request that an object be installed locally in addition to its other instances on the distributed computing platform. Column 10, line 64 through column 11, line 10. The Examiner has equated this last feature with the search request for the target resources as set forth in claim 17. Clearly, the request for a local instance of an object oriented programming object is not the same as receiving a search request for target resources, searching a database of resource information, determining whether one or more resource descriptions match the target description, and sending the information about matching resources to the client. Nowhere does Hunt describe “searching a database of target resources”, and the Examiner has provided no reference in Hunt to describe this limitation. Instead, the Examiner again tries to equate the interface function of the objects in Hunt with the resource descriptions of claim 17, which is also not applicable for the reasons set forth above. As Hunt clearly does not describe all the limitations set forth in claim 17, Applicant believes that claim 17 is allowable over the §102(e) rejection of record.

Claims 18-26 and 28-30 depend from claim 17 and inherit all the limitations there from, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 17.

Claims 18-26 and 28-30 each depend from claim 17 and thus inherit all of claim 17’s limitations. Applicant, therefore, respectfully asserts that claims 18-26 and 28-30 are allowable, for at least the reasons set forth, over the 35. U.S.C. §102(e) rejection.

Claims 31 and 42, as amended, require “associating one or more first descriptions with corresponding first resources ... wherein at least one of the one or more first resources is discoverable using a corresponding first description”, and “associating one or more first explanations with the corresponding first description ... wherein one or more of the first resources is discoverable using a corresponding first explanation”. As has been set forth in detail above, Hunt does not show first one or more first resources discoverable using a corresponding first description, nor does Hunt show one or more first resources discoverable using a corresponding first explanation. As Hunt does not describe the above limitations set forth in claims 31 and 42, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 31 and 42 are patentable over the §102(e) rejection of record.

Claims 35 and 37 have been canceled. Claims 32-34, 36, 38-41 and 43 each depend from claim 31 and thus inherit all of claim 31's limitations. Applicant, therefore, respectfully asserts that claims 32-34, 36, 38-41 and 43 are allowable, for at least the reasons set forth, over the 35. U.S.C. §102(e) rejection. Claims 44-46 each depend from claim 42 and thus inherit all of claim 42's limitations. Applicant, therefore, respectfully asserts that claims 44-46 are allowable, for at least the reasons set forth, over the 35. U.S.C. §102(e) rejection.

Claim 47 requires "computer instructions for: receiving a search request for the target resources from a client including a target description describing the target resources", "searching a database of resource information", "determining whether one or more resource descriptions match the target description", and "sending result information about matching resources to the client". Hunt does not describe these limitations. As stated above, Hunt describes a distributed application architecture having distributed programming objects. Hunt does not disclose searching a database of resource information, nor sending result information about matching resources to a client. As Hunt does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 47 for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 47 is allowable over the §102(e) rejection of record.

Claims 48-56 and 58-60 each depend from claim 47 and thus inherit all of claim 47's limitations. Applicant, therefore, respectfully asserts that claims 48-56 and 58-60 are allowable, for at least the reasons set forth, over the 35. U.S.C. §102(e) rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 27 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,624 to Teare et al. (hereinafter, "Teare").

Claims 27 and 57 depend from claims 17 and 47, respectively, and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable base claim for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 17 and 47, respectively. Specifically, claims 17 and 47 each require, through their dependencies from claims 17 and 47, respectively, "receiving a search request for the target resources from a client, including a target description describing the target resources", "searching a database of resource information", "determining whether one or more resource descriptions match the target description", and "sending result information about matching

resources to the client". For the reasons set forth with respect to claims 17 and 47, Hunt does not describe these limitations, and Teare is not relied upon by the Examiner as teaching these limitations. Applicant, therefore, respectfully asserts that claims 27 and 57 are allowable, for at least the reasons set forth, over the 35. U.S.C. §103 rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025, under Order No. 10001421-1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV482744349US, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231, on the date shown below.

Date of Deposit: February 11, 2005


Typed Name: June Nguyen

Signature:



Respectfully submitted,

By



Thomas J. Meaney
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No.: 41,990

Date: February 11, 2005

Telephone No. (214) 855-8230